



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/713,037

11/17/2003

Nicholas John Doran

048462-5003-01

1140

22903

7590

11/13/2006

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP

ATTN: PATENT GROUP

THE BOWEN BUILDING

875 15TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 800

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-2221

EXAMINER

LEE, DAVID J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

58

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/713,037	Applicant(s) DORAN ET AL.	
	Examiner David Lee	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 and 39 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-32, drawn to a method of communicating using optical pulses comprising: launching the optical pulses into an optical fiber communication system including a plurality of sections having dispersion of opposite sign, the pulses being launched at a wavelength at which the system has normal average dispersion, no amplifier being disposed between a first pair of adjacent sections from the plurality of sections, the first pair of adjacent sections being mutually exclusive from the second pair of adjacent sections, classified in class 398, subclass 148.
 - II. Claims 33-36, drawn to a method of communicating using soliton or soliton-like optical pulses, the method comprising: launching the soliton or soliton-like optical pulses into a dispersion-managed optical-fiber communication system, at least some soliton or soliton-like optical pulses being transmitted at a wavelength at which the system exhibits zero average dispersion, classified in class 398, subclass 146.
 - III. Claims 37 and 39, drawn to a method of communicating using optical pulses comprising: transmitting the pulses over an optical fiber communications system including a plurality of sections having dispersion of opposite sign, the pulses having a wavelength and a magnitude that allow the pulses to propagate in the system under normal average dispersion a bandpass filter being disposed within at

least one section of normal average dispersion from the plurality of sections, the bandpass filter being disposed at a center of each of the at least one normal dispersion section from the plurality of sections, classified in class 398, subclass 148.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are unrelated because Invention I is directed to a system comprising a first pair of adjacent sections being mutually exclusive from the second pair of adjacent sections, wherein the plurality of sections having dispersion of opposite sign and no amplifier being disposed between a first pair of adjacent sections from the plurality of sections; neither Inventions II nor III disclose the limitation of "no amplifier being disposed between a first pair of adjacent sections from the plurality of sections" or the limitation of "a first pair of adjacent sections being mutually exclusive from the second pair of adjacent sections." Invention II is directed to system where soliton or soliton-like optical pulses are transmitted at a wavelength at which the system exhibits zero average dispersion. Neither Inventions I nor III disclose a system which exhibits zero average dispersion and Invention III does not disclose or even suggest the use of soliton or soliton-like pulses for transmission. Invention III discloses a system wherein pulses have a wavelength and a magnitude that allow the pulses to propagate in the system under normal average dispersion, and a bandpass filter being disposed within at least one section of normal

Art Unit: 2613

average dispersion from the plurality of sections, the bandpass filter being disposed at a center of each of the at least one normal dispersion section from the plurality of sections. Neither Inventions I nor II disclose or even suggest the use of a bandpass filter.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. A telephone call was made to Christopher Hutter on 11/7/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.


Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-2220. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2613

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



David Lee
Patent Examiner



JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600